



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Chamberlain, a council of delegates plenipotentiary from the different parts of the Empire. Such a council, according to Mr. Holland, would resemble the German *Bundesrath*; but it would probably be more nearly akin to the Diet of the old Germanic Confederation than the Federal Council of the present Empire. In fact, an organization so constituted would necessarily be very loose.

Like almost all writers on the subject, Mr. Holland does not appear to be sufficiently alive to two factors in the problem. One is, that as in the case of most other recent confederations, considerable sacrifices, real or apparent, will be necessary on the part of the members of the Empire if any true federal government is to be attained. The other is, that the United Kingdom and the English-speaking colonies are not the whole, they are in fact a small part, of the Empire; and it cannot be assumed that the position of the rest will settle itself. In the "General Observations" with which the book opens, Mr. Holland remarks (p. 14): "In the British Empire, apart from India, we have learned by a most costly experience, to concede to the colonies the fullest liberty consistent with the maintenance of the common tie." But this is in fact true only of a small part of the colonies. Leaving out not only India, but all those colonies adjacent to India, such as Ceylon and the Federated Malay states, the vast proportion of the people of the English dependencies have not self-government. The population of the West Indies, Egypt, and the English possessions in tropical Africa, far outnumbers that of Canada, Australia and the Cape; and it is by no means clear that the placing upon a satisfactory footing of the relations between England and the colonies with a responsible government, difficult as that is, would solve the problem of the British Empire.

A. L. LOWELL.

*Oxford Studies.* By JOHN RICHARD GREEN. Edited by Mrs. J. R. GREEN, and Miss K. NORGATE. (London: Macmillan and Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xxxii, 302.)

ONLY the first of these papers can be regarded as strictly historical. The rest are collections of the anecdotes and gossip of Oxford in the eighteenth century which was the nadir of academic decadence or of the social and economical peculiarities of the period. The first paper deals with the infancy of the medieval city, a subject on which Mr. Green's authority is first rate. Perhaps it is his antiquarian bias that makes him rather espouse the cause of the city against the university. He seems to think that the university stunted the growth of the city, stifled its municipal liberties, and prevented it from becoming a commercial center. What should have made Oxford a commercial center? Its district is purely agricultural. It is on the Thames; but so are other towns in the district, such as Abingdon and Wallingford, which nevertheless have not become commercial centers. What but the university in fact has been the making of Oxford? The boarding of so many students must surely have been a considerable article of commerce. That municipal authority should have to yield something to the exigencies of academical discipline

seems no great evil. In the eighteenth century the city council of Oxford topped the height of parliamentary corruption by openly putting its representation up for sale.

The Norman Conquest in Mr. Green's opinion brought with it a sudden outburst of industrial effort, a sudden expansion of commerce, and accumulation of wealth. The blessing came to Oxford in disguise, for, as Mr. Green says in his history, the number of houses marked "waste" in the survey marks the terrible suffering of Oxford in the Norman Conquest.

The most curious part of Mr. Green's picture of the ancient city is the description of the Jewry, which will serve, if it is still necessary, to correct common ideas of the position and attitude of the medieval Jew.

"The most characteristic result of the Conquest was planted in the very heart of the town in the settlement of the Jew. Here as elsewhere the Jewry was a town within a town, with its own language, its own religion and law, its peculiar commerce, its peculiar dress. The policy of our foreign Kings secured each Hebrew settlement from the common taxation, the common justice, the common obligations of Englishmen. No city bailiff could penetrate into the square of little streets which lay behind the present Town-hall; the Church itself was powerless against the synagogue that rose in haughty rivalry beside the cloister of St. Frideswide. The picture which Scott has given us in *Ivanhoe* of Isaac of York, timid, silent, crouching under oppression, accurately as it represents our modern notions of the position of his race during the Middle Ages, is far from being borne out by historical fact. In England at least the attitude of the Jew is almost to the end an attitude of proud and even insolent defiance. His extortion was sheltered from the common law. His bonds were kept under the royal seal. A royal commission visited with heavy penalties any outbreak of violence against these 'chattels' of the king. The thunders of the Church broke vainly on the yellow gaberdine of the Jew. In a well-known story of Eadmer's, the Red King actually forbids the conversion of a Jew to the Christian faith: it was a poor exchange which would have robbed him of a valuable property and given him only a subject.

"At Oxford the attitude of the Jewry towards the national religion showed a marked consciousness of this royal protection. Prior Philip of St. Frideswide complains bitterly of a certain Hebrew with the odd name of 'Deus-cum-crescat,' who stood at his door as the procession of the saint passed by, mocking at the miracles wrought at her shrine. Halting and then walking firmly on his feet, showing his hands clenched as if with palsy and then flinging open his fingers, the mocking Jew claimed gifts and oblations from the crowd who flocked to St. Frideswide's on the ground that such recoveries of limb and strength were quite as real as any Frideswide had wrought. But though sickness and death, in the prior's story, avenge the insult of his shrine, no earthly power, ecclesiastical or civil, seems to have ventured to meddle with 'Deus cum-crescat' The feud between the priory and the Jewry went on unchecked for a century more, to culminate in a daring act of fanaticism on the Ascension day of 1262. As the usual procession of scholars and citizens returned from St. Frideswide, a Jew suddenly burst from the group of his comrades in front of the synagogue, and snatching the crucifix from its bearer trod it under foot. But even in presence of such an outrage as

this the terror of the Crown shielded the Jewry from any outburst of popular indignation. The sentence of the King condemned the Jews of Oxford to erect a cross of marble on the spot where the crime was committed ; but even this was remitted in part, and a less offensive place was allotted for the cross in an open plot by Merton College."

Mr. Green is not alone in ascribing the great ecclesiastical buildings as well as the great castles to the money bags of the Jewish capitalist. It may have been so, but has any distinct proof been produced ? In the Chronicle of Jocelyn de Brakelond we have a monastery borrowing of a Jew, as is known to the readers of *Past and Present*. But the Jews were banished from England by Edward I. in 1290 ; with which date the outlay on the building and extension of ecclesiastical edifices certainly did not cease. The date of the building of Salisbury Cathedral is 1220 to 1258, within the Jewish period ; but, if Murray's *Handbook to the Cathedrals* is to be trusted, we know whence the money came. The sum (40,000 marks) was raised by contributions from the prebendaries themselves ; by collections from different dioceses, to each of which a prebendary of Salisbury was sent ; and by liberal grants from various benefactors, such as Alicia de Bruere, who gave all the stone necessary for the work during twelve years. The general influence of Jewish capital is not doubtful. But in the case of ecclesiastical buildings the Church had in popular faith a great bank on which to draw.

At the origin of the university Mr. Green barely glances. In fact almost nothing can be known. The millenary of Alfred has called attention to his legendary character as founder. Popular fancy ascribes great institutions to great men. It ascribed to Alfred trial by jury, and the division of the shires. But it was the legend that caused the interpolation in Asser's Chronicle, not the interpolation in Asser's Chronicle that gave birth to the legend. Nor is there any real ground for suspecting of fabrication so respectable an antiquary as Camden.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

*Essays in Historical Criticism.* By EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE. [Yale Bicentennial Publications.] (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xii, 304.)

Nor infrequently busy professors, who cannot find time for large compositions yet cannot be content to permit all their work to remain in an ephemeral form, rescue their articles from journals and make of them a book. Such books are likely to be distinctly miscellaneous, and Professor Bourne's is no exception to the rule. Yet there is a certain unity. The title well expresses it, and characterizes the writer, for in all his historical writing thus far published Mr. Bourne has revealed himself chiefly as a keen and accomplished historical critic.

But the phrase "historical criticism" has in current use more than one meaning. The professional student ordinarily uses it as meaning the critical discussion or dissection of the original sources or materials of history. Five of the essays in this volume are of this variety : the long dis-